



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

08/661,530 06/11/96 LUDWIG

L VCOR-001/13U

EXAMINER

LM21/0313

COOLEY GODWARD CASTRO HUDDLESON & TATUM  
FIVE PALO ALTO SQUARE  
3000 EL CAMINO REAL  
PALO ALTO CA 94306

DINH, D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2756

DATE MAILED:

03/13/98

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.  
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

OFFICE ACTION SUMMARY

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12-1-97

☒ This action is FINAL.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 21-55 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 21-55 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been  
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of Reference Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

#### DETAILED ACTION

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

*A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --*

*(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.*

Claims 21-22, 30-31, 39-40, 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ahuja et al. 5,471,318.

As per claim 21, Ahuja teaches a multimedia collaboration system comprising:

a plurality of workstations [fig.1 #12, #14];

AV capture tools [fig.2 Video manager 43, Audio Manager 44], at each workstation, configured to capture voices and images of users;

an AV network [network 10, servers 54 and 58], in communication with the workstation, over which audio and video signals can be carried;

a data network [network 10, server 50], in communication with the workstations, over which data signals, representing visual information other than captured images, can be carried;

reproduction facilities [managers 40, 42, 44], at each workstations, configured to reproduce one or more of the visual information and voices and/or images; and

a storage system configured to store data, audio and/or video signals that can be subsequently retrieved [col.12 lines 36-50].

As per claim 22, Ahuja teaches the visual information is a snapshot [col.12 line 44 "video recording of selected part ..."], information associated with an application program [col..12 line 44 "...store certain information related to computer program ..."], a real-time display of video images [a conference].

As per claim 30-31, 39-40, 47-48, they are rejected under similar rationales as for claim 21-22 above.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

*(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.*

Claims 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahuja and further in view of Koval et al. US patent 5,333,299.

As per claim 23, Ahuja does not teach how to synchronize the signals when playback. Hence, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to look for teaching to synchronize the signals. Koval teaches a multimedia streams playback method using one stream as master for synchronizing other streams. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use Koval teaching with Ahuja because it would have enable synchronized playback of the various recorded signals.

As per claim 24, it is apparent the system as modified would have time code recorded with the signals in order to synchronize the playback.

Claims 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahuja and Koval and further in view of Maeno "Distributed Desktop Conferencing System".

As per claim 25, Ahuja does not specifically disclose annotation tools. It is well known in collaborative conferencing art to have annotation tools. Maeno teaches a conferencing system with Antonio tools for annotating the visual information [p.0522]. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill to use Maeno teaching with Ahuja because it would have enable the conference attendee to collaborate and interact with the visual information.

As per claim 26, Maeno teaches sharing of visual information [p.0522].

As per claim 27, it is well known in the art to retrieve stream data (e.g. Audio, video etc.) by time. It is apparent that the system as modified would have means for retrieving the information using time codes.

As per claim 28, Maeno teaches annotate portions of visual information [p.0522 col.1 last paragraph].

As per claim 29, Maeno teaches user can perform document processing, electronic mailing, etc. during a conference [p.0523 1<sup>st</sup> col. Section 3.1.3]. Hence, it is apparent that the user can access the stored visual information during a conference.

As per claims 32-38, 41-46, 49-55, they are rejected under similar rationales as for claims 23-29 above.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for response to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the date of this action. In the event a first response is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event will the statutory period for response expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Serial Number: 08/661,530  
Art Unit: 2756

-6-

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9655. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 AM - 4:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frank Asta can be reached at (703) 305-3817.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

**Any response to this final action should be mailed to:**

**Box AF**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, DC 20231

**or faxed to:**

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications; please mark "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE")

(703) 308-5359 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).



Dung Dinh  
Patent Examiner  
February 27, 1998